

## United States Patent and Trademark Office



DATE MAILED: 09/24/2002

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/825,910	04/04/2001	Serge Muller	14XZ00098	3729
7	590 09/24/2002			
JAY L. CHASKIN General Electric Company 3135 Easton Turnpike - W3C			EXAMINER	
			CHURCH, CRAIG E	
Fairfield, CT	U0431		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2882	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>∤</b> ′ ⊶	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary		
Onice Action Summary	Examiner	Group Art Unit
—The MAILING DATE of this communication app	pears on the cover sh	eet beneath the correspondence address—
Period for Reply		_
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.	T TO EXPIRE	MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE
<ul> <li>Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 Cl from the mailing date of this communication.</li> <li>If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days,</li> <li>If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by def</li> <li>Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by</li> </ul>	, a reply within the statutory fault, expire SIX (6) MONTH	minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. S from the mailing date of this communication .
Status		
☑ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 8/20	102	
☐ This action is FINAL.	•	
<ul> <li>Since this application is in condition for allowance exc accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle,</li> </ul>		
Disposition of Claims		
X Claim(s) 17-20	is/are pending in the application.	
Of the above claim(s)		
© Claim(s) 1, 6, 7	is/are allowed.	
S Claim(s) 2-5 8-10 17-20	is/are rejected.	
□ Claim(s)		is/are objected to.
□ Claim(s)		are subject to restriction or election requirement.
☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Dra	•	
<ul> <li>□ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Draft</li> <li>□ The proposed drawing correction, filed on</li> </ul>	is 🗆 approv	ved □ disapproved.
<ul> <li>□ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Draft</li> <li>□ The proposed drawing correction, filed on is/are ob</li> </ul>	is 🗆 approv	ved □ disapproved.
<ul> <li>□ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Draft</li> <li>□ The proposed drawing correction, filed on</li> </ul>	is □ approvojected to by the Examin	ved □ disapproved.
<ul> <li>□ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Draft</li> <li>□ The proposed drawing correction, filed on</li></ul>	is □ approvojected to by the Examin	ved □ disapproved.
<ul> <li>□ The proposed drawing correction, filed on is/are obtained.</li> <li>□ The drawing(s) filed on is/are obtained.</li> <li>□ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.</li> <li>□ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine.</li> <li>Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)</li> <li>□ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority.</li> <li>□ All □ Some* □ None of the CERTIFIED copies.</li> <li>□ received.</li> </ul>	is approvolected to by the Examinar.  y under 35 U.S.C. § 11 s of the priority documen	yed □ disapproved.  ner.  9(a)-(d).  nts have been
<ul> <li>□ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Draft</li> <li>□ The proposed drawing correction, filed on</li></ul>	is approvolected to by the Examinar.  by under 35 U.S.C. § 11 of the priority documenar.	ved □ disapproved. ner.  9(a)-(d). nts have been
<ul> <li>□ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Draft</li> <li>□ The proposed drawing correction, filed on</li></ul>	is approvolected to by the Examinar.  y under 35 U.S.C. § 11 of the priority documenational Bureau (P	yed □ disapproved.  ner.  9(a)-(d).  nts have been  CT Rule 1 7.2(a)).
□ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Draft   □ The proposed drawing correction, filed on   □ The drawing(s) filed on   □ is/are obtained is/are	is approvolected to by the Examinar.  y under 35 U.S.C. § 11 of the priority documenational Bureau (P	yed □ disapproved.  ner.  9(a)-(d).  nts have been  CT Rule 1 7.2(a)).
□ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Draft   □ The proposed drawing correction, filed on   □ The drawing(s) filed on   □ is/are obtained is/are	is approvolected to by the Examinar.  by under 35 U.S.C. § 11 s of the priority document mber)  International Bureau (P	yed □ disapproved.  ner.  9(a)-(d).  nts have been  CT Rule 1 7.2(a)).
□ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Draft   □ The proposed drawing correction, filed on   □ The drawing(s) filed on   □ is/are ob   □ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.   □ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine   Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)   □ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority   □ All □ Some* □ None of the CERTIFIED copies   □ received.   □ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Nut   □ received in this national stage application from the   *Certified copies not received:    Attachment(s)	is approvolected to by the Examinar.  by under 35 U.S.C. § 11 s of the priority document mber)  International Bureau (P	yed □ disapproved.  ner.  9(a)-(d).  nts have been  CT Rule 1 7.2(a)).

- P 13

• 1 st

U. S. Patent and Trademark Office PTO-326 (Rev. 9-97)

Serial No. 825,910 Art Unit 2882

12

It is required under 37 CFR 1.84g that legends be added to the block symbols of figures 4 and 5. Elements 32 and 33 discussed on pages 9 and 10 of the specification are not illustrated in figure 2 as described. Correction is required.

Claims 2-5, 8-10 and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claims are so poorly written that their metes and bounds cannot be ascertained. The limitations conveyed by the following terms or phrases are unclear:

claim 2 -- means for recognition --

claim 3 --detection element-- (detect what?)

--adapter-- (adapts what?)

claim 4 --element having a given x-ray absorption removably fixed on the device--

claim 5 -- means for coding --

claim 8 --image chain--

- --parameters of the object--
- --parameters for acquisition--
- --parameters of the means for receiving--
- --parameters for positioning the device--
- --set of rules--
- --possibly from one or more parameters chosen by a user--

-3-

Serial No. 825,910 Art Unit 2882

jì

claim 9 --image chain--

--parameters of the object--

--parameters for acquisition--

--parameters of the means for receiving--

--parameters for positioning the device--

--set of rules--

--possibly from one or more parameters chosen by a user--

claim 10 --element--

claim 17 Words seem to be missing from lines 6 and 7.

claim 18 --coder--

--means for recognition--

claim 19 -- image chain--

--parameters of the object--

--parameters for acquisition--

--parameters of the means for receiving--

--parameters for positioning the device--

--set of rules--

--possible from one or more parameters chosen by a user--

claim 20 -- support --

Claims 1, 6 and 7 are allowed.

Applicant's arguments filed August 20, 2002 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive. The deficiencies in the claims are far more than typographic errors as

-4-

Serial No. Art Unit 825,910 2882

remarked by applicant. The claims are so poorly written that their metes and bounds cannot be ascertained. For example, what limitation is represented by the phrase --parameters of the object--? Is this the color of a person's eyes? Is --means for coding--a cryptographic translator? Claims 2-5 have not been amended at all, and claims 8-10 have only been amended superficially (such as changing prepositions).

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Examiner Church at telephone number (703) 308-4861.

Crong E Church

CRAIG E. CHURCH Senior Examiner ART UNIT 2882